

81270113
SUMMER NUMBER

81270113

Humanist

World Digest

"Whatever concerns Humanity is of interest to me"—Terence

VOL. 23, No. 3
AUGUST, 1951

P. O. Box 75
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

COPY 25c
\$1.00 A YEAR

WHAT HUMANISTS MIGHT DO FOR PEACE

By BRENT DOW ALLINSON

•

What Needs Doing in Medical Practice

Dr. R. E. CLOWARD

•

Religion in Public Schools

By DR. CHARL ORMOND WILLIAMS

•

POINTS OF VIEW

And News Items of Interest

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

By WILLIAM E. ZEUCH, Ph. D.

THE IDEAL OF HUMANISM

We are seeking to present Humanism as a religious philosophy which denies no particular faith, but which provides a path over which all people can travel toward a unity that rises above the ruins and barriers of the old beliefs and sects which divide them. In behalf of this common faith, we would emphasize the constructive side rather than any opposition to outmoded philosophies.

TEN AIMS OF HUMANIST (World) FELLOWSHIP

- 1—Full endorsement of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations at the Plenary meeting December 10, 1948, and world-wide implementation and fulfilment of those rights at the earliest possible moment.
- 2—The use of science to serve society creatively and constructively in the preservation of life, the production of abundance of goods and services, and the promotion of health and happiness.
- 3—The establishment and furthering of scientific integral education in all schools and colleges so as to emancipate all peoples from the thralldom of ignorance, superstition, prejudices and myths which impede individual altruistic development and forestall social progress.
- 4—The widest promotion of the creative arts so as to release all potential artistic abilities and raise the general level of artistic appreciation.
- 5—The increase of social, recreational and travel activities in order to broaden the outlook and improve the intercultural understanding among all peoples.
- 6—A quickened conservation of the world's natural resources, including human resources, so as to arrest their wasteful exhaustion and wanton destruction and thus insure their longest preservation and widest beneficial use for man's survival on this planet.
- 7—The inauguration of a world-wide economy of abundance through national economic planning and international economic cooperation so as to provide a shared plenty for all peoples.
- 8—The advancement of the good life on the basis of a morality determined by historical human experience and contemporary scientific research.
- 9—The development of a coordinated private, cooperative and public medical program which will provide preventive as well as curative medicine and include adequate public health education and personal health counseling.
- 10—The expansion of United Nations functions (1) to include international police power with sufficient armed forces; (2) to prevent war and international economic controls capable of preventing world-wide monopolies and/or cartels.

HUMANIST WORLD DIGEST

(Combined with **WELCOME NEWS**)

Established February, 1898

ISSUED QUARTERLY

William E. Zeuch, Editor. Editorial Associates: Clifton Bennett, Franz Wertgen, Felix J. Frazer, Victor Yarros. Entered as Second-Class matter at the Post Office at Berkeley, California, under the act of March 3, 1879. Publication Committee: William E. Zeuch, Chairman; Clarence Rust, Anga Bjornson and E. O. Corson, Business Manager. Subscription Rate: \$1.00 per year. Advertising Rates: As space is available, classified ads are 10c a word. Address to Business Manager. Vol. 23, No. 3, July-August-September. All rights reserved. The Humanist World Digest, 1011 Heinz Avenue, P. O. Box 75, Berkeley, California.

The responsibility of signed articles in this magazine is accepted by the writers and does not necessarily reflect the views of the Humanist World Digest.

EDITORIAL COMMENT

OUR RELIGIOUS PURPOSES

The objectives, or ideals, of Humanist (World) Fellowship are stated in the Ten Aims which we carry on the inside of the front cover. These ten objectives, if you please, are the planks in our this-world religious platform. We have stated repeatedly that the business of religion is to make ideals real. Insofar as we really strive to realize these Ten Aims, these ideals, for all peoples in all parts of the world, we will be engaged in a profound religious task. We do not forget that religion, like charity, begins at home. We are fully aware, also, that the realization of these aims presents a great challenge. We know that there are, and will be, great differences of opinion on how best they may be realized. The most important thing, however, is that each one of us, as individuals and as members of various organized groups, including Humanist (World) Fellowship, be aggressive in his or her efforts to further the attainment of these Ten Aims. Since there are differences of opinions as to the best methods of achieving these objectives, even when there is general agreement as to their desirability as ideals, it is our intention to present various points of view on ways and means of realizing these Ten Aims. There are, to be sure, some persons calling themselves Humanists who fight shy of any specific proposals whatever for economic, political and social progress for fear of dissension among members of their group. We are not of that kind of ivory-towered Humanists. To us, ideals without action are sterile. Any religion that does not try to realize its objectives is, in our opinion, no religion at all.

TO COOPERATE OR NOT TO COOPERATE

Humanist World Fellowship, as we stated in the 1950 Spring Number of Humanist World Digest, was not organized to proselyte among Protestants, Catholics, Mormons, Jews or any other religious groups that are based on supernatural beliefs. We stated at that time that, "There are in the United States alone today more than eighty million persons, a majority of the population, who do not belong to any religious organization. These people have been exposed to Christian, Jewish, Mormon and other supernatural religions in churches, synagogues and temples as well as over the radio and through the religious press. They are not satisfied with the old-time revealed religions. In this scientific age they can no longer accept mythology and supernaturalism. Many of these eighty million left established religious organizations." We repeat this earlier statement because some readers have never understood clearly that, as a religion, Humanism is man-centered, rather than god-centered, this-worldly rather than other-worldly, scientific rather than supernatural. This does not mean that there are no possible areas of cooperation between Humanists and other religious groups. Insofar as other religious groups have this-world economic, political and social programs for human betterment and insofar as such programs are in accord with our own Ten Aims we could cooperate with them. But some of the god-centered, other-worldly religious groups appear to take the position that they will work with no group for any purpose on any basis unless it believe in the supernatural. It seems to be a case of "No supernaturalism, no cooperation." We deplore this, of course, but what is, is, and we cannot help it.

ARE WE EXPERT IN THEOLOGY?

An old friend writes to inquire whether I consider myself an expert in theology. Most certainly not. I am not sure just what an expert in theology might be. But I think that I could qualify as a long-time student of theology, or rather, of theologies. When I was in college around forty years ago every student of that particular school was compelled to attend chapel daily, take a two-year course in Bible, a one-year course in Christian Evidences and a one-year course in Theism. Else no graduation. We were forbidden to discuss these subjects in the classroom pro and con. We had to accept them as they were presented in this Presbyterian institution. That was supposed to be the Christian part of our higher education. Since my college days I have spent much

time reading the theology of Egyptian mythology, the theology of Greek mythology, the theology of Roman mythology and the theology of Hebrew mythology. Also, I have read much of the theology of the early Christian Fathers, of Thomas Aquinas and of others right down to Barth, Brunner and Niebuhr. The new orthodoxy is particularly diverting with its attempt to get back to the notion that man is vile, all vile, and that what the world needs, and only needs, is individual conviction of sin and global conversion, etc., etc. We hold, of course, to the scientific idea that man is not inately and inevitably vile, but rather that he is good or bad as physical and social heredity and contemporary environment from cradle to grave make him so. As for theology, we take it that as scientific method spreads and scientific results accumulate, men will speak more and more of the theology or theologies, of Christian mythology just as scholars now talk of the theology of Egyptian, Greek and Roman mythologies. We think that such would be the conclusion of any student who approaches the study of theology with scientific objectivity rather than with a will to believe, willy-nilly.

BACK TO ERASMUS

A correspondent takes us to task for being modern in our Humanism. He tells us that he thinks that we should present Humanism as exemplified in Erasmus, who lived during the early years of the Reformation. We respect Erasmus, of course, for what he was and what he thought in his day and age. We recognize that he had to be very cautious in what he said and wrote so as not to be burned at the stake by either the Catholics or Protestants of his time. But his Humanism is definitely dated. In view of all the development in thought, to say nothing of the development of scientific method, it seems strange that any modern person would ask us to go back to Erasmus. One could with as much lack of reason ask modern scientists to go back to the alchemists of Roger Bacon's time. No, we belong to the year 1951. We are the heir of all the ages and think and live in the light of that inheritance.

* * * *

Nothing is more amusing, as well as disgusting, than attempts of present-day Protestants and Catholics to make Christians of the Founding Fathers of these United States as well as their attempts to make our Government Christian. Yet nothing is better known to honest historians than that the chief of the Founding Fathers

rejected and repudiated Christianity and that the Constitutional Convention of 1787 rejected recognition of any religion. George Washington was the leading soldier, Thomas Paine the leading author, Benjamin Franklin the leading diplomat and Thomas Jefferson the leading statesman in the founding of our nation. Every one of them was a free-thinker, an infidel in Christian terms. Washington was a deist who did not believe in the divine origin of the Bible. He lived and died without any evidence of Christian belief. No prayers or grace are known ever to have been said in his home. The name or any mention of Christ is entirely absent from the thousands of his extant written utterances. He belonged to no church and never took communion. While President, he signed a state paper which asserted, "The Government of the United States is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion." Certainly, as the chairman of the Constitutional Convention and first President, he should have known what he was talking about. Thomas Paine's religious views are too well known to need clarification. Franklin maintained an amused skepticism until the end. In the last year of his life, when he was 84, the president of Yale wrote him, asking if he believed in a future life. Franklin replied that he did not know if there was a future life but he expected to find out soon. As for Thomas Jefferson, he looked upon Christianity as "our peculiar superstition" without one redeeming feature. He declared the Christian world to be divided into two classes—hypocrites and fools. He said that he thought the Father, Son and Holy Ghost a "hocus-pocus fantasm." He found Jehovah, the Christian God, "cruel, vindictive and unjust." Why the moral depravity and intellectual dishonesty of Christian writers and pulpiteers in now trying to claim these famous Founding Fathers as their own? If Washington, Paine, Franklin and Jefferson could know of such attempts they would be rolling in their graves with laughter, provided they were not angered at the impertinent presumption of some Christians.

WHAT HUMANISTS MIGHT DO FOR PEACE

Brent Dow Allinson

I

It should be obvious to a descending parachutist from Mars, or a space-ship navigator from Venus, floating in for a look-see at this Earth in the year 1951, that despite all our evangelizing, praying, rationalizing, mobilizing and organized fighting for peace in our peculiar human way, we are certainly not unlearning the ancient, ugly, and very costly habit of war. We are certainly not disestablishing war by the so-called "police action" in Korea.

The official Voice of America is broadcasting the official Truth around the world that we of the United Nations are fighting solely for peace and justice in Korea. The many radio voices of Moscow, speaking from North Korea, Manchuria and China, are busily broadcasting the Lie Direct to the official American or United Nations "line," and charging us with imperialist aggression and atrocious intervention in an Oriental family quarrel and protracted civil war. Our enemies are calling loudly for the expulsion of all the allied capitalist imperialists from Asia.

II

It occurs to us to suggest that if we were in truth doing what our official "line" asserts so confidently, we ought to be eagerly staging a demonstration of the reality of International Government before the confused and non-understanding eyes of the masses of the Earth—and especially of the Orient. If we really understand what we are doing in Korea—and General MacArthur's confusing political campaign for widening the war in Asia makes this appear highly improbable—ought we not to insist that the "war" in Korea should be terminated, provided a satisfactory cease-fire and truce to prepare a peace is not achieved, by Presidential declaration at any time that the reality of International Government has now been vindicated; and not that Communism or any other political or economic *ism* has been contained, dealt a coup de grace, or annihilating blow by superior Western organization and violence? It is not an *ism* which is our enemy, MacArthur and McCarthy to the contrary notwithstanding. It is international anarchy and primeval chaos, salted with old-fashioned imperialism and geopolitics, of which both sides are guilty, that is the enemy of peace and freedom in Korea.

III

This "war" cannot be won in old-fashioned terms. No military victory or arbitrary conclusion of so confused and passionate an anarchy as that which has been raging on the Korean peninsula for the past year is possible. Nothing but a peace-without-victory is realistically possible, if governments were intelligent to admit this; for it is veritably an irresistible revolutionary force which has come to blows with an immovable, individualistic object. It has all the earmarks of Armageddon—the Have-nots versus the Haves, Gog versus Magog, at the ends of the earth.

Humanists know this; they know further that the future must not, and will not, belong to the generals, the generalissimos, or the political commissars and totalitarians. It must and will belong to the outraged peoples, primarily in this instance, to the misled and massacred people of Korea. Humanists ought to be saying this; and insisting upon the development of a more enlightened and creative statesmanship than any which has thus far been displayed from Washington, Moscow and other capitals.

Humanists know that a major quarrel between rival governments and power-wielding organizations—as between trigger-happy, egocentric and immature individuals—can never be settled by physical force with anything more than a truce. Most political ideologies, like the *alibis* of individual contestants, are rationalizations of economic interests, largely, and of social prejudices. Such quarrels can be truly settled only by an appeasement of Justice through the creative and courageous exercise of moral and intellectual forces via lawful processes of accepted third-party judgment and honorable arbitration. Humanists see that the present awful conflict, howsoever rationalized, is only secondarily an ideological struggle; for many elements of individualistic capitalism and collectivist communism exist in both the Soviet consolidation and the curious Western alliance of republican, democratic, totalitarian, monarchical, socialistic and politically hybrid states now marshalled and spearheaded by American generals and politicians for their own political, economic and geopolitical reasons, some of which will not stand close moral and intellectual analysis.

Since Humanists know all this they should be saying so openly, boldly and persistently, this summer, this week, today, and keep on saying so, and at the same time be proposing that peace shall be offered officially to the bewildered Chinese and North Koreans until they shall be shamed into accepting it despite the U.S.S.R.,

admitting that peace has always been possible on honorable and intelligent terms.

IV

The quarrel in Korea will remain obscure and fundamentally unsettled, no matter how lengthily and uselessly the armies of the Great Powers or their stooges continue to devastate and slay Koreans and each other, until the underlying economic and political facts have been impartially, honestly and competently investigated and evaluated by lawful process and international judgment; specifically by third-party or neutral judgment.

Oddly enough, neither arbitration nor judicial judgment, or adjudication, of the bitter propaganda-obscured facts has yet been proposed by the United States, the United Nations or the Soviet Union, or rejected by the North Koreans and Chinese. Most of the significant diplomatic initiatives for peace have been taken by others, by Prime Minister Nehru, notably. How, then, can it be argued in Washington or in the American press, that the resources of diplomacy and peaceful settlement have been exhausted in this tragedy, and that only a successful appeal to violence will be heard in Pengyang or Peiping. This argument is curious and peculiarly inept for **the techniques of peaceful settlement available have not really been tried in this case.** Even the facts concerning the aggressive invasion of South Korea, on June 24th, 1950, have never been fully investigated or impartially established, although the United Nations had a special commission in Korea at the time. Why not?

V

The International Court of Justice, be it remembered, to which the British Government wisely appealed in the Iranian crisis over the nationalization or socialization of the subsoil resources of the country, was created and is maintained at considerable expense at The Hague as the sixth or seventh wheel of the elaborate United Nations stagecoach rumbling along unimpressively into an uncertain jet-plane future. Although the Court is not competent, perhaps to decide fundamental issues of economics, geopolitics and balance of power, or of antithetical civilizations, it was especially established for the judicial determination of clouded and controverted **questions of fact and international law**; precisely of the kind that have arisen in Korea and China. One may marvel that neither President Truman, Secretary Acheson, nor even a single senator of the Republican opposition in Congress,

or outside Congressional halls, for all their inconsequential and inconsistent talk, nor any member of the United Nations, has so much as suggested the use of the High Court for the settlement of the troubles and obscured questions of guilt for the aggressions, and alleged counter-aggressions and atrocities, against South and North Korea.

Such impartial international investigations and adjudications could be commenced, of course, only after a truce and after joint cease-fire directives had been issued by all governments whose armed forces now operate in Korea. Soviet Russia, as a founding member, would hardly venture to withdraw from the United Nations if its High Court and Assembly were veritably "ceased with the case," as the French say, and allowed freely with full powers to investigate, adjudicate and arbitrate it. Such arbitration should be accompanied by the joint abstention of the United States of America, the Soviet Union and all their belligerent allies, pending the outcome, after each had pledged itself to accept the judgments to be arrived at through the loyal concert of the lesser and disinterested powers.

VI

The use of the High Court is what Humanists the world over might well advance and insist upon if they are really deeply interested in throwing their moral weight behind efforts for peace through justice and for the realization of effective International Government. Even if, due to the limitations of our moral and intellectual powers, nothing more than a strategic truce or temporary armistice between the embattled communist and capitalist powers is achieved, Humanists ought to be the first to see the advantages of this respite. Further, Humanists should insist that, once peace is restored in Korea, a matter of many months at best, there must be a program of physical, political and social rehabilitation in Korea under the auspices of the United Nations, a program paid for by all parties contributing to the devastation.

* * * *

Private social welfare work originated in part in the charities of the church. The Christian community regarded itself as a fellowship whose members were responsible for the care of needy persons. Today, the Roman Catholic Church still maintains large, well-organized charities, and to Catholics, the term "charity" still has its full, rich, original meaning.

WHAT NEEDS DOING IN MEDICAL PRACTICE

Part II

Re-evaluation and Re-classification

Medical reform will require the same type of treatment that the surgeon prescribes for the eradication of an abnoxious neoplasm which is growing in the human body. It will necessitate a re-evaluation and a re-classification of those who are engaged in the "healing art," and an assignment of the re-licensed physician to the field in which he is best qualified to serve, thereby putting the "art of healing" on a scientific basis. For example: Every doctor who is now licensed to "practice medicine," chiropractors, osteopaths, optometrists, regulars and dentists, would be required to state in which field of medicine they considered themselves best qualified to serve, in the field of diagnosis or the field of treatment. They would then be given an impartial scientific examination and licensed in that particular department if qualified. Their grade and pay schedule would be based on their scientific knowledge and their ability to render public service. The licenses of those with no scientific knowledge would not be re-issued, and they would be required to seek other means of employment or else prepare themselves properly for the type of work which they desired to do.

Medical Schools Need Coordination

Medical schools would likewise be placed on the same scientific foundation, with the same course of study, the same curriculum. A precedent has already been set for this procedure. Shortly after the turn of the century the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching made a survey of the medical schools in the United States. At that time there were hundreds of them. California alone, had about forty-five medical schools authorized to grant licenses for the "practice of medicine." Medical schools were classified into A, B, C, D, E schools, according to their equipment and facilities for teaching. Some of the schools, like some of the wildcat banks, did not have even a building for their school and the only scientific equipment was a "box of old bones" or a few test tubes.

Following this revelation by the Carnegie Foundation, most of the State Legislatures, despite tremendous pressure and in defiance of the charge that they "were interfering with the rights of individual initiative and free enterprise," enacted laws which set up the minimum standard of equipment which a medical

school should possess and the minimum course of instruction which a doctor should have before the State Licensing Board would permit him to practice.

Many of the so-called medical schools were closed. Others amalgamated with other schools, thereby bringing their equipment and course of study up to the standard requirements. Others got around the law by claiming a special type of therapy and philosophy of disease, the chiropractic and osteopathic schools, and some of the naturopathic and christian science schools.

From the fact that scientific medicine is an accumulation of facts which has been built up from centuries and decades of laboratory tests is sufficient evidence to sustain the thesis that all medical schools should have access to these facts and teach them to those who are aspiring to become physicians. Public health is a public problem, in the same way that public education is a public problem. One of the most cogent reasons for public education, or that my neighbor be educated, is that he makes a better neighbor for me. A healthy neighbor is much better for me than an unhealthy one.

All medical schools should, therefore, qualify doctors by the same standard. When state controlled, graduation from any medical school should license the graduate to work in any state or community where his services are needed.

Salary According to Training and Ability

How would doctors be classified and what would be the pay schedule? The doctors would be classified as they are now classified into the various specialty groups. However, there would be no "general practitioners" nor "general surgeons." Each one would be a specialist in some particular line for which he had qualified. A doctor graduating from medical school and without any additional training, if he chose to stop there and do minor surgery, make house calls or be on an ambulance service, would not be in the same pay bracket as the one who had spent four or more years post graduate work in some specialty field. The pay schedule would be worked out by the doctors themselves. They would take into consideration ability to render public service of the most value. Training and ability would automatically determine one's income as it does not in most cases. However, these would be evaluated on a different level. They would not be based, as it frequently now is, on one's salesmanship ability or

the ability to sell one's skill for "whatever the traffic will bear," but they would be based on demonstrated achievement.

The minimum salary under state control should not be less than the present average annual income, which is now approximately five thousand dollars a year, but the income should be graduated up to at least ten thousand dollars a year, and higher according to training, ability, and general economic conditions. Such a fixed salary for work done would eliminate all charity operations and it would eliminate also the excessive bills which some doctors send out just because the patient can afford to pay it.

Number of Doctors Needed

How many doctors would it take for a state system of this type and could the osteopathic, chiropractic, optometrists and dentists be integrated into it?

At the present time there are approximately 200,000 licensed M.D.'s in the United States. This includes, Army, Navy and Public Health Physicians. There are approximately 11,250 osteopathic doctors, 5,000 chiropractic doctors, 82,000 dentists, and 20,000 optometrists. A total of about 318,000 who are engaged in the healing art or who are still living and have a license to practice.

A state system with our present population of 150,000,000 would require about 300,000 doctors of all types.

Under a National State System the population could be divided up into units of 5,000 which would be designated a Precinct Unit. Five Precinct Units could constitute a County or Ward Unit. The number of Precinct and County or Ward Units in the present geographical state or city boundary could be determined by the state, county or city population. With the present population it would require about 30,000 Precinct Units, and about 6,000 County or Ward Units, for the whole of the United States.

All sickness and injuries occurring within a precinct could first be seen by the precinct physicians and a complete diagnosis of their condition would be made. If of a minor nature, it would be taken care of in the precinct hospital. If the illness were of a major nature the patient would be sent to the County Hospital for definitive treatment. Dentistry might best be administered on the precinct level.

The Waste of Private Practice

In the case of Mr. X, if his injury had been correctly diagnosed, and correctly treated he would have been back to work again

in a few weeks, living in his own home, supporting himself and family, a respected member of society. Instead, as a result of our present methods, he lost in wages at least \$12,000 for the five years. His doctor's bills, if he had paid them, would have been at least \$2,000. And his hospital bills would have been at least \$2,000. This waste without attempting to put any value on the suffering for himself and family and the loss of their home.

The total hospital bed capacity in the United States at the present time is about 1,423,500. Under a State System with one fifty-bed hospital for each precinct of 5,000 and a one-hundred-bed hospital for each county unit of 25,000, there would be a total of 2,100,000 beds, or more than 600,000 more hospital beds than at the present time. The average number of beds occupied by the sick and injured at any one time is approximately 1,300,000. Therefore, under the State System the hospital bed capacity would be raised approximately 600,000 beds, which would be ample for any foreseeable emergency. But the probability is strong that many of the incurable cases now occupying beds could be cured and would be cured under a State System. Mr. X, if properly treated, would have been in the hospital not more than three weeks instead of nearly five years. It is the incorrectly diagnosed and inadequately treated cases which constitute the strongest factor in the high cost of medical care.

Could Medical Practices Be Integrated

Could the osteopathic, chiropractic and other licensed doctors be integrated into a state system of this kind? Many of them could. Most chiropractic doctors are more proficient in methods of physiotherapy than are many regular doctors, and in the treatment of bone and tendon injuries, most osteopathic doctors are more proficient than are the doctors from the regular schools, particularly the general practitioners or the so-called family doctor. In the fitting of glasses for certain types of defective vision, the optometrists are past masters in comparison with the old family doctor. It would be the simple procedure of assigning the physician to do the type of work for which he is qualified and remove him from the economic necessity of attempting to do that for which he has had little or no training and no qualifications.

(To Be Continued)

RELIGION AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Dr. Charl Ormond Williams

A former president of the National Education Association and now its
Field Director

The question of released-time religious education in the public schools, smoldering in this country for at least 44 years, burst into flame on March 8, 1948, when the Supreme Court of the United States rendered their 8-to-1 decision in the now-famous and history-making *McCollum Case*.

The Champaign program to which Mrs. Vashti McCollum objected was conducted on school property and on school time by religious teachers who were brought into the public schools by the non-public Council on Religious Education. The public school superintendent's "approval" of the teachers was necessary, although they were employed and paid by the Council. Public school teachers distributed the consent cards to pupils who took them home for their parents to express their choice of class—Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish—for their children to attend. Attendance records were reported by the religious teachers to the public school officers.

Thus there are three basic elements in the Champaign plan which the Court found to be violations of the First Amendment made applicable to the states by the Fourteenth Amendment: the use of public school property, the use of school time when pupils are compelled by law to attend school, and the "close cooperation between the school authorities and the religious council." These elements resulted in what the Court called the "utilization of the tax-established and tax-supported public school system to aid religious groups to spread their faith." The Supreme Court has decreed that the Fourteenth Amendment makes the First amendment applicable to the states and their subdivisions equally with the Federal Government.

The First Amendment reads:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

The "due process" clause of the Fourteenth Amendment reads:

"No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor

shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

There is wide-spread belief, in which I share, that if all the public schools should release all the children for an hour, more or less, one day a week for instruction in religion, that plan **also** would involve close cooperation of the public school and the use of the time of the public schools for religious teaching, and would thereby be unconstitutional. However, that particular feature **may** require another ruling by our highest Court. This plan would be known as "dismissed time," but to many it is another instance of a distinction without a difference. Wherein would lie the difference between releasing 8 per cent of the children, as now, for religious education and releasing 100 per cent of them for the same purpose?

Because I cannot state some facts that I wish to include in this fifteen-minute statement of mine as cogently as they appear in the opinion of Mr. Justice Frankfurter in which Mr. Justice Jackson, Mr. Justice Rutledge, and Mr. Justice Burton joined, I shall quote a few paragraphs:

"We are all agreed that the First and the Fourteenth Amendments have a secular reach far more penetrating in the conduct of Government than merely to forbid an 'established church' . . .

"The evolution of colonial education, largely in the service of religion, into the public school system of today is the story of changing conceptions regarding the American democratic society, of the functions of State-maintained education in such a society, and the role therein of the free exercise of religion by the people. It is appropriate to recall that the Remonstrance of James Madison, an event basic in the history of religious liberty, was called forth by a proposal which involved support to religious education."

The interest in popular education grew steadily, and with it strong claims for State support of religious education were put forth in various states resulting in stormy conflicts not unlike that which in Virginia had produced Madison's Remonstrance. Despite fierce sectarian opposition, New York State barred appropriations of tax funds to church schools, and later to any school in which sectarian doctrine was taught.

Horace Mann led the fight in Massachusetts that prohibited all sectarian teachings in the common schools to save them from denominational strife.

By 1868, one state after another had written similar prohibitions into their constitutions to the end that the separation of church and state had become the guiding principle in law and feeling of the American people long before the Fourteenth Amendment added to the Constitution in 1868 subjected the States to new limitations.

In the words of the four Justices:

"Separation in the field of education, then, was not imposed upon unwilling States by force of superior law. In this respect the Fourteenth Amendment merely reflected a principle then dominant in our national life."

The action of the States and the Nation in establishment of the principle of separation in the field of education was not due to any decline in the religious beliefs of the people. Both Horace Mann and James Madison were men of deep religious feeling. The claims of religion were not minimized by refusing to make the public school agencies for their assertion. If the public school was to fulfill its destiny in promoting cohesion among a heterogeneous people, the public school must keep scrupulously free from entanglement in the conflict of religious sects and leave to the individual's church and home his religious education.

The drive for a system of public schools free from Church entanglements moved steadily forward so that by 1875 the principle of separation of church and state was firmly established in the consciousness of the nation. In that year President Grant made his famous speech to the Convention of the Army of Tennessee:

"Encourage free schools and resolve that not one dollar appropriated for their support shall be appropriated for the support of any sectarian school. Resolve that neither the state nor the nation, nor both combined, shall support institutions of learning other than those sufficient to afford every child growing up in the land the opportunity of a good common school education, unmixed with sectarian, pagan, or atheistic dogmas. Leave the matter of religion to the family altar, the church, and the private school, supported entirely by private contributions. Keep the church and state forever separated."

President Grant believed so strongly in his convictions that he urged that an amendment be written into the United States Constitution prohibiting the use of public funds for sectarian education, such as had been written into many State Constitutions. Such an amendment Elihu Root urged for adoption in the New

York Constitution in 1894. In summarizing a century of the nation's history he said:

"It is not a question of religion, or of creed, or of party; it is a question of declaring and maintaining the great American principle of eternal separation between Church and State."

It is pertinent to note here that every State admitted into the Union since 1876 was compelled by Congress to write into its constitution a requirement that it maintain a school system "free from sectarian control."

In the wage of these long and bitter struggles to separate Church and State and thereby insure our religious freedom, and in disregard of the glorious and glowing pages of our history that depict them, leaders of Catholic and some Protestant groups are now attempting to turn the clock back for a resurgence of those strife-torn times.

The free, tax-supported public school was designed to educate the children of all races, creeds, nationalities and cultures without regard to economic status. Truly it has been the "melting pot" of our national society. In addition to teaching the curriculum prescribed by law, the teachers in these public schools have **always** felt a deep responsibility for inculcating into the hearts and minds of their pupils the spiritual and moral values inherent in the faith and practice of the great religions. Neither the school systems, nor the teachers who man them, are hostile to religion. The American people as a whole approve the efforts of the teachers to teach the good way of life in a democracy to their children; to teach in a positive way cooperation, self-denial, tenacity, courage, kindness to men and animals, sense of duty, love of truth, loyalty, justice, freedom, love of country, sensitivity to beauty, creative thought, the open mind, as well as sharing in a common cause, respect for personality, the worth of every individual, increasing control over one's own destiny, moral fiber, and help, not exploitation, of the weak, or backward one.

The education of the child is the responsibility of the home, the church, the school, and the community. Not one of these institutions or agencies should shirk its own responsibility, nor try to force it on the shoulders of any one, or all of the others.

The great battle for religious freedom waged by Jefferson, and carried to conclusion by Madison was the most bitter and stubborn, as Jefferson recorded, of his long political career. The story of this fight including its immortal documents—Jefferson's Ordinance for Religious Freedom and Madison's Remonstrance—

should be taught in public and private schools to every school child in the land in each generation as long as this nation endures. Let us hear again some of the ringing words of Jefferson's Immortal Ordinance:

"Well aware that Almighty God hath created the mind free; . . . that to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical . . ."

For his great work of religious freedom, Jefferson was called an "infidel" by the political preachers of his day. Now the public school that was in part the outgrowth of his philosophy and legislation is called "godless" by some priests of our day.

The memory of man is short as witnessed by the efforts of well-intentioned religious leaders who would impair the foundations of our religious liberty in order to build a superstructure of uncertain strength and merit. While we repair the breaches already made in the "wall of separation between Church and State" erected by our forefathers, we should labor unceasingly to prevent the third and the fourth, and still other breaches we were warned against by the four Justices who dissented in the New Jersey Bus Transportation Case. All who put their shoulders to the wheel to maintain our freedom of religion may count themselves the spiritual descendants of two of America's greatest statesmen and scholars—Jefferson and Madison.

"ISMS"

Do you ever run across the bird who raises his nose aloft in the course of an argument and snorts, "Oh, that is an ism. I don't believe in any isms. My thoughts are free and not confined to any doctrine."

When you do, don't reach for something to fling at him. There are more subtle methods of torture. Just kid along and let him blah blah at length. While he is at it you can make notes, and I will bet the rest of my hair that almost every idea that issues out of his ventilator can be ascribed to some "ism" or other.

An ism is defined as a doctrine or a system. Science, philosophy, literature and art, in fact every field of thought, is just one long history and succession of doctrines, theories and systems.

The brightest minds of the human race have given birth to them. It is stupid to believe that we can think about most anything without paying homage to some belief, doctrine or conviction. Nearly all of our opinions are founded upon some system of thought, or "ism."—Marvin Canford in THE SEARCHLIGHT

INTERNATIONAL ADOPTS FAR-REACHING PROGRAM FOR SOCIALISM AND PEACE

Garry Fullerton

(Garry Fullerton was a member of the U. S. delegation to the International Socialist Conference)

Frankfurt, Germany, June 27-July 3, 1951—The reconstitution of the Socialist International is the most important development in democratic socialism since the war. It offers impressive testimony of the tremendous hold of socialism in the hearts and minds of men everywhere.

Thirty-four socialist and labor parties are now affiliated with the International. Their combined membership is 9,783,000, and their total vote in the most recent elections is 43,543,000. Socialists control the governments of three countries and three federal states.

They participate in the governments of five countries and 51 federal states. They are the chief opposition in a number of other nations. Together they constitute by far the most powerful democratic political force in the world.

The new International (for it really is a "new" International despite its claims of direct descent from the Second International) differs from its predecessors in three important respects.

First, it differs in **structure**, since it is an association of free and independent parties operating by consent and not by compulsion. Its decisions are not binding.

Second, it differs in its **approach** to general political and economic problems, being less doctrinaire and more supple than the former organizations.

Finally, on the subject of **war**, it endorses the concept of collective security.

The change in structure is emphasized in the Statute of the organization which was adopted unanimously by the convention and with very little discussion. "The Socialist International," proclaims the Statute, "is an association of parties which seek to establish Democratic Socialism, as defined in 'The Aims and Tasks of Democratic Socialism.' The purpose of the Socialist International is to strengthen relations between the affiliated parties and to coordinate their political attitudes and actions by consent."

Varied Means to Socialism

Thus, "Socialist planning can be achieved by various means. The structure of the country concerned must decide the extent of

public ownership and the forms of planning to apply." "The various forms of public ownership should be regarded not as ends in themselves but as means of controlling basic industries and services on which the economic life and welfare of the community depend, of rationalizing inefficient industries or of preventing private monopolies and cartels from exploiting the public." "Socialist planning does not presuppose public ownership of all the means of production."

"Socialist planning does not mean that all economic decisions are placed in the hands of the government or central authorities. Economic power should be decentralized wherever this is compatible with the aims of planning." And finally, "All citizens should prevent the development of bureaucracy in public and private industry by taking part in the process of production through their organizations or by individual initiative. The workers must be associated democratically with the direction of their industry."

Aside from its content, the significance of the declaration lies in the fact that it is the first comprehensive statement of the principles of democratic socialism since Karl Marx's famous inaugural address to the First International in 1864. More important, however, it is the first time in history that such a declaration has been arrived at democratically by cooperative effort.

Marx and Engels drew up the first declarations without consulting anyone. Later documents were similarly composed by one or two individuals. The present manifesto, however, is the joint work of eleven parties which met in committees over a period of nine months, considered ideas from various sources, reconciled them and fitted them into a document of modest length. It is a simple, straightforward and authoritative statement of what Socialists believe, and it should serve as a workable instrument for propaganda and recruiting.

Collective Security Endorsed

Collective security is the third and final point which distinguishes the new International from its predecessors. The position is indicated in the fourth section, "International Democracy," of the declaration of principles and also in a special resolution on "Socialist World Action in the Struggle for Peace."

It is necessary to read the two statements together in order to obtain a clear picture of what Socialists stand for in this respect. Although agreement was by no means as unanimous on these

points as on the other resolutions, still not a single vote was cast against the declarations.

Peace is one of the fundamental aims of socialism, declares the resolution. Socialists do not believe that war is inevitable. They believe in peace and they work for peace and for a world in which conditions will favor international and universal disarmament.

Today, unfortunately, "free democracies cannot defend themselves against the threat of totalitarianism without arms," and "Cominform policies have compelled free democratic countries to give a high priority to military defense."

The principle of collective security has proved successful in Korea and it will continue to be successful if "the whole of the free world unites and makes itself invulnerable to military aggression, political penetration and economic collapse."

But arms alone are not enough. It is therefore vital for the free democracies to have a constructive social and economic policy aiming at full employment and a high standard of living."

These, then, are the principal features of the new International. They have permitted the International to lay a solid foundation for future expansion and to adopt a realistic program of action.

This International is not likely to flounder on the rocks of internal dissension, for it is built not so much on compromise as on unity. It will enable Socialists to carry on a really effective struggle for socialism at home and for peace in the world.—Abstracted from Garry Fullerton's article, "Socialist Call," of July 20, 1951.

* * * *

The following is a quote from "Human Breeding and Survival, Population Roads to Peace or War," by Burch and Pendell. Copies of this book may be obtained from the Humanist World Digest at thirty-five cents each.

Uncontrolled breeding, as many students have long seen, favors the survival and the multiplying of the least gifted.

Unless men see the problem and work on it, America, soon after the year 2,000, will be a nation of high-grade morons ruled by the few surviving clever people. It will be no more of a democracy than any other monkey house. But, of course, the mass, sitting on bleachers and watching free prize fights, will shout all the ancient slogans of democracy.

I would like to go on record as believing that, unless the round table conferees who will be working on peace problems in the coming five years face, and at least partly solve, world population problems, this immense war just finished will have been fought in vain.

—Walter B. Pitkin

POINTS OF VIEW

COWED BY FEAR

(Reprinted from "Looking Forward," the official publication of the Humanists, 2307 So. Union Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.)

What happens to us?

Fear settles on our souls.

I visit people at organizations, schools, universities and in the street. They are afraid. I meet students, group members, the "average man." They are afraid. When they feel they may trust you, they look around first to see whether we are alone before they express their feelings, their real selves. They are afraid of their shadows. Are we drifting more and more toward that regimenting totalitarianism we condemn?

They say: "I am afraid of war, but what can I do? Don't we have to prepare for war because the Russians are forcing war upon us? Do the Russians really want war? If we are attacked we'll have to fight . . ." They are afraid and confused.

We Hide Our Fear

Subconsciously, the fear people have in them is the realization of the destruction possibilities of another world war. The individual feels that his or his children's lives are seriously threatened, and not knowing what to do, he is cowed by the impressive war preparations.

In the face of war preparation directed all over the world by "those who know," and conditioned by newspaper and radio propaganda to accept a future world war as inevitable, many of us remain silent about our hidden fears of war, because we are afraid to be "so unpatriotic" or "so cowardly" as to say openly that the survival interests of mankind—including the U.S.A.—cannot be served through preparation for war.

Former Thinkers Cowed

University professors and other teachers used to be exceptions from such regimented behavior patterns of subservience. As a rule, they are not only logical thinkers, but they also have time or take time, to read, collect information from the world-over, and they do not make up their minds upon one-sided or single source data, such as supplied by the daily press. But university men and other teachers are now called names—they are branded as disloyal or dupes or even "fellow-travelers," —if, through viewing Man's plight as objectively as they can, they come to the conclusion that wars may destroy all mankind including the "victor."

What Happened to Us?

Hating the Russians, are we also becoming the enemies of mankind and ourselves? Do we have to intimidate our teachers and try to compel them to teach war when deep in their souls they know that a new world war would be a global catastrophe which may liquidate victor and vanquished equally? In my humble opinion, such psychopathic social behavior is suicide. It is like saying: "I know that when engaged in destroying the Russians in a new atomic world war, we will also destroy ourselves. But what can we do? We **must** prepare for murder and suicide, because the Russians compel us!"

Facing such a psychopathic world, the teacher—himself a product of his environment—will become either a hypocrite, or a psychopath, or a crushed person. He is not really a teacher any more. He is a cowed member of a cowed mob, of a mob which is being stampeded toward slaughter. I have talked to these teachers recently. do not recognize them. They are not their former free selves. They are a demoralized and pitiful group, not living but vegetating, and trying to save their jobs—for the remaining few pre-war years.

Humanism Gives Hope and Courage

As a Humanist, with faith in Man and his ability to create a better world through a socially applied scientific attitude (including desire and good will), I **refuse** to accept the suicidal theory that a world war is inevitable! I **refuse** to become a cowed teacher, a cowed business man, or a cowed "average man"! Russians or no Russians, I still wish to believe that my children and grandchildren **can** survive and I am convinced that I don't need to atomize them or irradiate them with the rays of death!

With faith in Man, I wish to survive! Without preaching any other ism than Humanism, I wish to engage in fact-finding for a better world, not in blame-finding for world destruction. With good will in my heart toward all and malice toward none. I wish to negotiate for survival and while negotiating I do not permit my open mind to be clogged by shortsightedness, prejudice or hatred.

All of us should insist that Truman, Stalin and other heads of states should thus negotiate with each other and for us—scientifically, and **not** with some ulterior motive of power-politics or special group interests. They should get together at once, before the present wars engulf the globe, and negotiate a peace, and go

on negotiating with good will for all (and not for the supposed benefit of a single nation only) no matter how long it takes.

And fears of being subdued should not beset us. With faith in Man and a humanistically re-interpreted scientific attitude, we should not be cowed into silence and the conformity of war preparations. With **deep** feeling and **clear** logic, we must remain free and courageous advocates of peace and through Peace of a better world. With faith in Man, we wish and **will** survive!

—Dr. D. M. Morandini in "Looking Forward"

TOWARD A NEW SOCIETY

The world of tomorrow? . . . It is indeed a question whether there will be any **new** world . . . But granted that the world does go on, what about the pattern of the new society? More particularly, what about the pattern of things here in America? For it is to the American scene that we are devoting our attention. . . . That America is in process of transition is apparent to all who have eyes to see and ears to hear.

It is possible only to hint and suggest; he would be a fool who endeavored to draw a "chart-correct" of the future America, when so much is uncertain and so little seems plain. Yet there are broad outlines that may be discerned, highly probable aspects of the new society that may be charted.

The kind of individualism that has marked so much of our American history appears at an end. This does not necessarily mean that the individual counts for less or should count for less. Rather it means that his place and the fashion in which he plays his part in society will be profoundly modified in the near future, even as it has already undergone serious change. When certain large organizations speak of "free enterprise" and the "right of the individual" they are either disingenuous or they are "fooling themselves." There was a time when the individual citizen in America had a fairly wide future before him, under a few restrictions he could pretty well express himself, make his fortune, with little or no interference. The restrictions were those of common decency and public opinion, and they were rather flexible; freedom, in what now seems an extreme sense, was granted.

Today the meaning of "free enterprise" and the "right of the individual" has changed. For what these terms usually mean today is that American business, more particularly "big business," ought to have the right and the freedom to "get ahead" without government interference, legal restriction, and the constant neces-

sity of accommodating itself to the demands of labor, the requirements of public policy, and the affirmations of an awakened social conscience.

At every point today, the individual is "cabined, cribbed, confined!" This may be for good or bad—that is not our interest here. The point is that from police regulations about driving speed to the Security Exchange Commission's control of the stock market, there is constant interference with the individual's self-expression. And the area of interference is growing rapidly so that almost no part of the citizen's life is without some measure of control. It is this fact that points the way to the nature of the new society. Whatever may be said of this coming order, it will be one of increasing control of the individual. Some may not like this trend, others may approve it. But whether we like it or not it is on the way and we can do little or nothing to arrest it. The best we can do is to try to direct it to a growth as sound and healthy as possible.

The emerging social system in America, the new society appearing in this land, whether we like it or not, will be collectivist. Whether it will be democratic or something else depends upon what we do about it. The real danger is that we shall be so slovenly and indifferent in our attitude, so ready to follow a policy of laissez-faire, that we will permit a monopolistic or even militaristic clique to control the life of the nation. Our tremendous opportunity is to see to it that the "common man" is at the center of the picture, and that American democracy evolves from individualism into a planned society in a way that will safeguard all that is best in the free traditions of the nation.

—W. Norman Pettinger in
"The Historic Faith and a Changing World"

WHO IS ABOVE SUSPICION?

I was called on last week to take a part in a detestable business, the vouching for the loyalty of a friend of mine. And, detesting it, I had to go through with it to protect him from the suspicion which might have been aroused by my failure to vouchsafe the voucher.

The United States Civil Service Commission sent me a printed form headed "confidential inquiry" which read:

"The individual identified below has been appointed to or is an applicant for the position indicated. We are endeavoring to establish whether or not this person is suitable for

this position from the standpoint of character and loyalty to the Government of the United States as well as general fitness for the position mentioned. To assist us in this connection we ask that you complete the form answering all the questions asked below and on the reverse side as fully and as specifically as possible and return it to us immediately."

The person in question is a young man who is working his way through college by some part-time work in a government position. A few months ago I had been asked to recommend him for the position, and I replied attesting to his general character and ability. He was given the job and is working at it. Presumably his work is satisfactory. Yet now I have been asked to vouch for his loyalty to the United States government.

But who vouched for me as a voucher?

And who vouched for those who vouched for me? In the hysterical atmosphere in which our national affairs are being conducted, is anyone above suspicion? Are we approaching the situation where no one is above reproach except Senator McCarthy? And who vouched for him?

Who vouched for the members and employees of the United States Civil Service Commission? And who vouched for the persons who vouched for them? Who vouched for the members of the so-called Loyalty Board which in Washington listens to all the gossip which can be picked up from slanderous persons and used as a basis for discharging the slandered persons without a hearing?

Have our fears of communism so bewitched us that nobody is above suspicion, and everybody has to be vouched for by others who likewise are not above suspicion?

A lot of congressmen appear to think that Secretary of State Acheson is a Communist, and the Chicago Tribune is convinced of it. The Tribune thinks that President Truman is one. But who gives the Tribune a voucher—even that its publisher is loyal, much less that he has any capacity to pass on the loyalty of others?

General MacArthur implies that everybody who doesn't want a full-scale war right now with Russia and China is to be suspected. But why isn't he to be suspected of wanting to put us into a third world war so poorly prepared. Who vouches for him?

—James O. Monroe

MODERN RELIGION AND THE MATURE MIND

Christian religion as we have known it, took over as its own a premature psychological theory (social inheritance of Adam's depravity): a theory established long before there was any equipment of research or experiment to give it validation. In taking over this premature theory, Christianity condemned man to a psychological hopelessness to which Christ himself bore no witness. It declared him to be basically impotent to work out his psychological salvation. Instead of encouraging him to develop all the characteristically human powers within him, and so overcome inner contradictions and outer obstacles, it encouraged him to distrust himself and malign himself. It encouraged him to cast himself upon a Power greater than himself—and to credit, not his own nature, but that mysterious Power, with every virtue that seemed to reside in his own thoughts and behaviors. In short, it encouraged the individual to remain a dependent child.

Religion does ill to cling to old interpretations of human life . . . Where a thing as complex and inadequately known as our own nature is being dealt with, there is need for a constant alertness to new discoveries and implications . . . If we go freshly at the task of describing the religious way of life, we would have to start with the concept of man's growth (historically and individually) from infancy to adulthood; from immaturity to maturity; from egocentricity into a socio-centered linkage with his world. We have to think of the individual (and race) moving toward a wholeness as the essential thing to care about. Is he increasing his knowledge, responsibility, affection, and awareness of the wide inter-relationships that make all men one in destiny?

Unity can be achieved only among religions that accept the maturing of man as the central aim in life. Religions that, in however sanctimoniously disguised a form, encourage the mutual enmities of men cannot be "unified" in any significant sense because they in themselves are not agents of unity. Religions of the sword and stake and religions that insist on a childlike dependence of man upon an all-powerful and all-commanding Deity have no conception of man as a creature of inherent dignity. They cannot, therefore, induce him to grow into a mature wholeness of life. Either, in religion, we serve a belief that encourages a man's growth or we serve a belief that keeps him immature. The two beliefs are basically and forever incompatible.

—Harry Overstreet in *The Mature Mind*

NOTE—We are pleased to be advised, and also give Dr. A. Wakefield Slaten proper credit as the author of the "Meditation" which appeared in the January issue and also for "Words of Aspiration," in the May number.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Dear Doctor:

It has seemed to me that ever since 1938, the liberals in the U.S.A. have been in a process of retreat. The militant administrators were quickly shifted out of the Government service following the 1938 elections. Politically, the feeling has deepened that any man who has ever stood for anything is politically vulnerable. Labor leaders do not want such people to run for office. Democrat manipulators are even more opposed to having anything to do with any person who may have stuck his neck out. The consequence is that we are fast coming to the point where no person who can be elected to public office is capable of operating on an idea level.

A few weeks ago, J. Edgar Hoover made the statement that we had 870,000 potential subversives in the U.S.A. This figure obviously includes every person who has ever given a dollar to any organization that has been held to be communist controlled. No effort is made to distinguish whether such an organization was communist controlled at the time that such a person made his contribution.

The 870,000 people referred to are now barred from employment by ECA. They are barred as a matter of federal law. They are not barred from employment by other federal agencies as a matter of law. If some courageous administrator is willing to employ such a person, everything is O.K. But, unfortunately, there are few such administrators left any more. They all left Washington following the 1938 elections. Ninety-nine times out of a hundred, the average administrator is likely to decide that it is not worth taking a chance. Why run the risk of a fight with the McCarthys and other kinds of witch hunters. The average administrator is a Caspar Milquetoast. He does not like to be regarded as a fascist or a fascist stooge. He has no guts to speak of. He would like to avoid trouble with the McCarthys and also with the few militant liberals who are still fighting.

I think that the thing that characterizes the present scene, is the growth of cowardice. Cowardice is growing like a rank weed all over the place. It is growing in places where you would never

have thought possible for it to take root. When you bar from public employment the 870,000 people who have been moved by a generous impulse, you have people left who are not going to put up any real resistance against something horribly evil that may come around at a later date. That evil something is not here yet. The obstacles to its coming are being studiously and carefully removed.

People are now badly frightened. As time goes on they will become more and more frightened. It is pretty hard to reason with a frightened man, even when you can sit down and talk to him. In the present situation, the people are being frightened "en masse" by the people who control the mass media. You have no way of reaching them. It seems to me that people will support any project that is advanced if it is argued that it will safeguard them. It will be pretty futile to go to the people and argue with them that they must be just, generous, christian or anything else.

I know of many things that would frighten people more than the atom bomb, if they were made known. They will be made known as it becomes necessary to frighten people and keep them lined up behind an ever-expanding war program.

The person who tries to stand against the official program, will be branded the agent of the enemy. Any person can now be destroyed by having the communist label pinned on him. As this thing goes on, the class of people who will be vulnerable to attacks of this kind will become larger. A few can protest and get some kind of reconsideration. By and large, the administrator who does the hatchet job, will take the course of least resistance. No matter how convincing the record may be, he can always say that an element of doubt remained.

A lot of innocuous people who are taking us on the Hitlerian Road dislike to be called Fascists or road builders for fascism. The thing that is most disturbing is not the strength of the fascists but the fact that the will to fight has left the opposition. If you took any group of trade unionists and put them in front of a machine gun with instructions to dig their own graves, they would do it rather cheerfully if they were promised time and a half for overtime.

—A Former Congressman

* * * *

Brazil is not only the largest of the American republics, it is one of the three or four largest in the world. Occupying half of the South American continent, it extends 2,670 miles north and south and 2,690 miles on the east-west axis.

THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY'S COLUMN

The Humanist World Digest, like every liberal magazine, needs the full support of its readers and their friends to help it gain its objectives, namely: to foster Humanist education and action; to foster and promote the general welfare by furthering human rights and values; to encourage ethical living; to establish mental and physical health; to broaden social responsibility and cultural, religious, artistic and scientific development as a basis for a peaceful and democratic world order.

People interested in these objectives will help further this good work by keeping subscriptions renewed for themselves and their friends. The time to do it is now!

INTERPRETING HUMANIST OBJECTIVES

HUMANIST FELLOWSHIP is a religious association incorporated under the laws of the State of California with all the rights and privileges of such organizations. It enrolls members, charters local societies, affiliates like-minded groups, establishes educational projects and ordains ministers.

HUMANIST FELLOWSHIP defines religions in terms of two inseparable historical processes: (1) the ages-long quest for ultimate human values; and (2) the continuous effort to realize these values in individual experience and in just and harmonious social relations. Humanism affirms the inviolable dignity of the individual and declares democracy the only acceptable method of social progress.

MODERN HUMANISM seeks to unite the whole of mankind in ultimate religious fellowship. It strives for the integration of the whole personality and the perfection of social relationships as the objectives of religious effort. Humanism, in broad terms, tries to achieve a good life in a good world.

and individual hatreds. Human solidarity requires that each person consider himself a cooperating part of the whole human race striving toward a commonwealth of man built upon the principles of justice, good will and service.

HUMANISM seeks to understand human experience by means of human inquiry. Despite the claims of revealed religions, all of the real knowledge acquired by the race stems from human inquiry. Humanists investigate facts and experience, verify these, and formulate thought accordingly. However, nothing that is human is foreign to the Humanist. Intuitions, speculations, supposed supernatural revelations are all products of some human mind so must be understood and evaluated. The whole body of our culture — art, poetry, literature, music, philosophy and science must be studied and appreciated in order to be understood and appraised.

HUMANISM has no blind faith in the perfectibility of man but assumes that his present condition, as an individual and as a member of society, can be vastly improved within the limitations of